

# MANATRON

November 28, 2005

To: Valued Indiana Manatron Customers

As a follow up from our previous letter in October, we want to provide some additional information that you may find useful with regard to your DLGF Data Status Report. Our staff has compiled and analyzed all of our ProVal, ACAMA and eCAMA customer's status reports and identified the most common issues. This letter contains a summary of our findings in addition to suggestions and solutions that we can offer to assist you in gaining compliance.

In the event that you have rejected or incomplete items on your Data Status Report, the most important course of action for you is to inform the DLGF that you have a plan to become compliant and provide the specific steps that you are taking to become compliant. This plan must be expressed to the state by February 1, 2006 in efforts to prevent the retention of the county's PRTC funds.

The following are major issues that have been found consistently throughout the state:

## **Real Property:**

### **Rejections**

1. **DLGF District Codes (Proval):** The export to the DLGF contains the local district codes. In order to become compliant, you will need to have the DLGF district codes in the file beginning with pay 06. For prior years, if this is the only issue under Reject you may submit in writing to the LSA the local numbers and the corresponding DLGF codes. If there is more than one issue, the data will need to be resubmitted for said year. We recommend all counties convert to the state mandated district numbers since they are required to be used by LSA and the DLGF, Manatron can assist with this process.
2. **Individual AV Fields Not Populated (eCAMA):** The eCAMA State Export program has been updated such that the values for: Dwelling AV, Farmland AV, Classified AV, and Homesite AV can be properly extracted from the Parcel file. As well, the modifications have been made to extract the correct data for the Improvement Value field in the IMPROVE file. To resolve, the export must be run again on the archived data.
3. **Parcels without District Codes (Proval):** The parcels can be located for the county with a SQL script. The problem with not having a parcel assigned to a district, you run the risk of not accurately passing values to the auditor. This information must be corrected in the live data.

### **Warnings:**

4. **Use Codes: (Proval, eCAMA, ACAMA):** It has been expressed to us by a number of our clients that there is a good deal of disagreement between what they consider to be a valid/acceptable use code versus what the state has established in the Guidelines. Please contact DLGF or LSA staff regarding the appropriate use codes.
5. **Blank Av Codes (ACAMA):** This issue will be address in the Acama product in December and data will be resubmitted.
6. **Improvements with a "0000" value for "Year Constructed" in the Improve file (Proval).** This has been explained to the LSA and DLGF and is now no longer an issue of contention.
7. **Improvements with a "0000" value for "Effective Construction Year" in the Improve file (Proval).** This has been explained to the LSA and DLGF and is now no longer an issue.
8. **-001 Value for "Year Constructed" in the Improve File (Proval):** A value of "OLD" has resided in the data, for some improvements as a method of describing the age of a structure when the age is beyond a certain point. This value results in an inappropriate result. This can be address with scripts with Manatron's assistance.
9. **-001 Value for "Effective Construction Year" in the Improve File (Proval):** A value of "OLD" has resided in the data, for some improvements as a method of describing the age of a structure when the age is beyond a certain point. This value results in an inappropriate result. This can be address with scripts with Manatron's assistance.

### **Personal Property**

#### **Rejections:**

1. **The Personal Property Data (PERSPROP and POOLDATA tables) was not remitted (Proval, eCAMA, ACAMA):** Providing that your county possesses a Personal Property system, it is our understanding that compliance will only be achieved once data, or a reasonable timeline for submitting data, is received by the DLGF and LSA. We have been notified that each county must first complete their data entry and submit said data for the current year. Subsequently, the county is expected to strive to become compliant for years prior. A memorandum from the state is to be distributed in the coming weeks.

For those counties that do not have a Personal Property system in place at the present time, please contact Manatron for a demo of their iDox product line.

### Sales Data

1. **Questionable "Condition of Sale" data and "Other" (eCAMA):** It is believed that this issue can be rectified by simply providing the state with a letter of explanation detailing the reason for the expressed concern. It seems that the items related to this issue are specific for each jurisdiction, making it difficult for us to categorize the concern. If there are questions, additional clarification should be sought with the LSA/DLGF.
2. **No 2004 sales (eCAMA):** Likely caused by either a lack of 2004 sales data in the county's data set, or the extraction was run with an incorrect range of sale dates. Resolution can only be attained by adding the records that are sought and/or executing the export with the proper date ranges.
3. **Data set incomplete due primarily to duplicate records and small size when compared to SDF revenue (eCAMA):** Simply put, a comparison has been made between the number of records contained within the data submission and the number expected based on the Sales Disclosure Fund revenue statement. This may be in part due to truly duplicated entry of sales data, or the non-entry of all sales transactions. Reporting tools are available to assist the county in resolving this issue.
4. **Data records for some fields appear incomplete or inaccurate (eCAMA):** The SDDC offers a description of items that are "unpopulated" or are all populated with an "N" (no) on a yes/no field. In most instances, this includes "Buyer and Seller phone numbers" (unpopulated), and all "N's" for the following fields; **entire parcel, type deed, condo, mobile home, adjacent land, split**, significant changes, seller paid point, other real property (trade), family business, seller finance, and personal property. With regard to the items listed above in bold font, a subsequent export would bring the data into compliance. For those not highlighted, the county may wish to repair the data by identifying suspect records and adding the appropriate data where available.
5. **No data submitted (ProVal, eCAMA, ACAMA):** It should be noted that if your jurisdiction does not presently utilize a Sales solution provided by Manatron, you must seek resolution with the vendor responsible for the submission of this data.

### **Sales Non-Compliance Resolution**

Provided that the above matters of contention can be resolved by the county, within the current year's assessment database, Manatron will supply the necessary services to ensure that a subsequent data submission is made on your behalf, in compliance with the standards prescribed by the LSA/DLGF.

Alternatively, if these issues require only a letter of explanation, direct correspondence should be addressed to the appropriate body by the county.

It is important to note that a rejection must be corrected and resubmitted to the LSA/DLGF. This must be done in order to achieve compliance. Warnings will need to be corrected in the live database for future submissions. Manatron is here to help by providing the following services: If we previously performed your extract, an archived copy of your data is in our possession. With that, corrections can be made and data can be resubmitted to the appropriate parties.

#### **Pricing is as follows:**

Resubmission of corrected extract: \$350.00/per extract

Running scripts and correcting data: \$150.00/per hour minimum 2 hours

There will be an authorization sheet faxed to your office for signature prior to beginning work on the project. Please contact Vicki Cole for Proval/ACAMA clients and Khris Seger for eCAMA clients.

We are aware that the state is still in the process of issuing compliance letters and there may be additional issues needing attention. If you find that an issue has not been addressed in this letter or you have other concerns, we will be more than happy to assist your county in bringing its data into compliance.

We encourage you to contact the DLGF and the LSA with any questions that you have on your Data Status Report. Please contact Manatron support with any questions that you may have regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

Your Manatron Team

Cc: Melissa Henson, DLGF  
Diane Powers, LSA  
Marty Ulanski, Manatron, Inc.